DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 865 FL 013 636

AUTHOR Delson-Karan, Myrna
TITLE A Three-Dimensional Approach to Evaluating Teaching Performance.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 25p.; Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (New York, NY, November 25-27, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Language Teachers; *Lesson Observation Criteria; *Second Language Instruction; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This article presents an innovative system for the evaluation of teaching performance. Assessment forms, developed in a research project, give a 3-dimensional view of a teacher's performance as seen by: (1) the supervisor, (2) the teacher him/herself, and (3) the students of the teacher. A review of the literature which served as background to this study is presented. Copies of the forms themselves are then provided. The originality of this system lies in the following: (1) It is the only existing 3-dimensional system to evaluate teaching performance. (2) The forms are easy to use, since unlike many previous observational systems, they require no special training for their implementation. (3) It contains a student-reaction questionnaire, rarely found in observational systems, that is specifically geared toward foreign language teaching and that can be used both at the secondary and university levels. (4) It evaluates verbal and nonverbal behavior, and provides a means of assessing teaching performance both objectively and subjectively. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228865

Myrna Delson-Karan

A THREE-DIMENSIONAL APPROACH TO EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

The criteria for excellence in teaching are mirrored in the instruments of evaluation that are used. Objective systems of evaluating teaching performance are rarely used. The assessment of a teacher's performance, therefore, is often left to the subjective reactions of supervisors. Some of the available forms that are used to evaluate teaching performance do not adequately reflect a teacher's true capabilities. The result is that they do not always accomplish their main purpose, which is the improvement of teacher performance.

One of the important reasons for the lack of usefulness of many of the forms currently in use is that they are not specifically geared to foreign language instruction. Usually one general form, relating to all disciplines, is used by the student-teaching supervisor or the TA trainer at the pre-service level, or the departmental chairman at the in-service level.

The few assessment forms that are aimed toward evaluating a foreign language tend to be theoretical rather than practical. In addition, they often require extensive training in order to be able to use them. They do not provide a practical tool to help foreign language teachers to pinpoint their strengths and weaknesses.

It was to fill this need that the researcher initiated a project to create an evaluation system specifically intended for the foreign language teacher that was easy to use, since it requires no special training for its implementation. The purpose was to help the members of the profession to establish effective standards of teaching, and to provide them with a fair and constructive means of measuring teacher performance.

FL013636

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Myrna Delson-Karan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

After careful examination of the literature and of assessment forms currently used in many institutions, the researcher produced a set of forms that have proven to be highly successful measures of teaching performance. Their effectiveness lies in the fact that they indicate, in very practical, specific ways, just how a teacher can become a better teacher.

The main reason for the effectiveness of this system is that it is three-dimensional. It allows the teacher to see the supervisor's view of his teaching, to judge his own teaching, and to learn how his students are evaluating his performance.

The student's view of a teacher's performance is often the most accurate, yet it is rarely sought after. Some universities now use a general type student evaluation form for professors of all disciplines. On the secondary level, student evaluation forms of any kind are rarely used. This system provides an effective student reaction questionnaire to be used specifically in the foreign language classroom. It is suitable for use at both the secondary and university levels.

This three-dimensional system is unique in that it provides an objective observation system that allows for subjective reactions as well. It is more thorough, and yet easier to use than previous systems. It therefore fills an important gap in teacher evaluation methods.

In order to devise the instruments which comprise this three-dimensional evaluation system, the researcher carefully reviewed the literature.

ASCERTAINING THE QUALITIES OF OUTSTANDING TEACHERS

One of the best ways to establish effective criteria for teaching is to examine the qualities exhibited by outstanding foreign language teachers. Most teachers have a concept of what constitutes an outstanding

teacher. However, Gertrude Moskowitz did a study which supplied some 'hard' data on the classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers.[1] She found, for instance, that outstanding foreign language teachers used the foreign language more than typical foreign language teachers. They also tended to use non-verbal behavior more than typical teachers. In addition, outstanding teachers used a number of indirect behaviors, such as joking, praising, personalizing questions. Leonard Brisley edited a report in which data was supplied by a survey made in many parts of the U.S. and effective practices in high school foreign language classes were outlined and described.[2] Robert Politzer and Louis Weiss did a study on successful foreign language teachers in which they sought to ascertain what teacher behaviors were related to student achievement.[3] They found that students achieved more in classes where the teachers used free-response drills, visual aids, and a great variety of drills in one lesson. William Alexander, in his book entitled, "Are You a Good Teacher?"[4] discusses in detail the teaching methods of teachers who get the best results, and the characteristics of best teachers. Some of these characteristics are that the teacher is a warm and friendly person, has strict control of the class, is interested in and understands the class, is interested in and understands the students, and is impartial in his treatment of students. A valuable source for understanding the criteria for good foreign language teaching is still Theodore Huebener's book, How to Teach Foreign Languages Effectively.[5] His outline of Standards of Teaching is extremely practical and timely.[6] David Aspy and Flora Roebuck examine in depth the effective ingredients of teaching and teacher training in their book, Kids Don't Learn from Teachers They Don't Like.[7] They stress humanistic values in teaching, and the training of teachers in interpersonal skills.

These are but a few of many sources available which outline and describe just what qualities are responsible for producing an outstanding foreign language teacher.

STUDYING PREVIOUS OBJECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL TECHNIQUES

In order to formulate these assessment forms, the researcher studied previous observational techniques.

N.L. Gage[8] and Robert Travers,[9] in their handbooks on teaching, identified and described many classroom observation systems. Rosenshine and Furst analyzed the origins of more than seventy classroom category systems that had been developed from many different sources, including psychotherapy, group dynamics, learning theory, cognitive theory, and instructional theory.[10] There is a multi-volume anthology, written by Anita Simon and Gill Boyer that outlines more than 70 observational instruments.[11]

Probably the most well-known systems of objective evaluation are called interaction analysis systems. This approach consists of setting up classifications of the various criteria that indicate good teaching practices and recording the interaction of students and teacher while the lesson is in progress.

The most widely used observation system is the Flanders system of interaction analysis.[12] Categories of behavior are assigned a number, and the observer records behavior by category onto a 10 by 10 matrix every three seconds. The 10 categories in the Flanders system are: 1) Accepts feelings, 2) Praises or encourages, 3) Uses ideas of students, 4) Asks questions, 5) Lectures or orients, 6) Gives directions, 7) Criticizes or justifies authority, 8) Student-talk specific, 9) Student-talk-open-ended or initiated, 10) Silence or confusion.

Another system of interaction analysis in the cognitive domain is the Aschner-Gallagher system.[13] Their system concerns the levels of thinking of teachers and students. It revolves basically around four major categories: 1) Cognitive memory, which represents reproduction of the facts, 2) Convergent thinking, which involves the analysis and integration of remembered data, 3) Evaluative thinking, which deals with matters of value judgements, 4) Divergent thinking, which concerns individuals generating their own ideas.

Although it is well known that the use of nonverbal behavior greatly influences how we communicate, few observation systems include a means of evaluating it. Charles Galloway developed a model for the study of nonverbal behaviors and combined it with the Flanders system.[14] Peggy Amidon devised a complex means of observing nonverbal communication[15] which has also been combined with the Flanders system. She examines four nonverbal dimensions: 1) the arrangement of the classroom, 2) the supplies and equipment available, 3) the gestures, facial expressions, voice inflection, and the physical movement of the teacher, 4) the types of activities and the materials actually used.

Observational instruments based on the Flanders system have been developed to evaluate foreign language teaching. For instance, Nearhoff's system is comprised of ten categories which measure the amount of teacher talk and student talk, and the use of the target language and the native language in the classroom.[16] E.C. Wragg developed an interaction system in which the original categories pertaining to foreign language teaching were added.[17] Perhaps the best known interaction analysis system for foreign language is Gertrude Moskowitz's FLint system, (Foreign Language Interaction System).[18] By using the FLint system, the teacher of foreign languages is able to identify whether he was more indirect or

direct when using the foreign language, English, and nonverbal behaviors. He can also ascertain the actual percentages of time the teacher and students each spoke in the foreign language and in English during the lesson. Moskowitz's matrix for this system, based on the Flanders matrix, has 29 categories and is therefore 29 by 29 rather than 10 by 10 as in the Flanders system. Moskowitz was able to prove that student teachers trained in her FLint system became more successful teachers.[19] More recently, Constance Knop has suggested a simplified checklist for analyzing interaction in class, and an evaluation sheet to be used by an observer containing the following four categories: 1) Lesson Planning, 2) Techniques Used, 3) Class Climate, 4) Ability in the target language.[20] Alice Omaggio has developed a rating sheet where behaviors of students and teachers are recorded every fifteen seconds.[21] She discovered that teacher effectiveness ratings obtained from supervisors and students are significantly correlated with the degree to which verbal interactions are personalized in language classes.

REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT FORMS CURRENTLY IN USE

In order to create the present three-dimensional system, the researcher not only relied on past studies concerning teacher evaluation, but also examined carefully the assessment forms currently in use in many institutions in New York City and New York State. If supervisors and teachers wish to use forms that reflect the programs in their local area, they can send to high schools and universities in their own city and state, and use them to create forms that would deal directly with their own curriculum goals.

RATIONALE FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

Since so many observational systems already exist, one might question the necessity of creating another. It is important to note that the accuracy, reliability, and practicality of both the Flanders and FLint systems have been challenged.[22] The FLint system, which enjoyed a wave of popularity in the 70's, has fallen into disuse for the most part because it is very complicated to use, and requires special training for its implementation. A great deal of time is required to memorize the numbered categories in the existing interaction analysis systems, and to become proficient in using them. It also became apparent that it is impossible to measure teaching performance solely in objective terms. Some subjective assessment is also necessary to get a true picture of a teacher's performance.

The forms presented here contain the most important features of previous systems, and yet they are simple and easy to use. They are multi-dimensional in their theoretical composition, since they aim toward evaluating both verbal and nonverbal behavior, and contain categories to record social-emotional, cognitive, and administrative behaviors. Other systems often set out to measure only one of these dimensions. In addition, since the teacher is able to see himself from three perspectives instead of just one, a true picture of his performance in the classroom emerges.

THE USE OF THE FORMS

It is impossible to observe everything during one lesson. In using these forms, teachers and administrators have to judge those aspects of classroom performance that appear in a particular lesson observed. A "not applicable" column is provided for this purpose. In addition, these forms allow for write-in items, so that the individual criteria of the particular language program in which they are being used can be included. On each form, space is provided for free comments. Anecdotal information is as important in the assessment of teaching as information acquired from answers to objective items. Thus, this system provides a means of assessing teaching performance both objectively and subjectively.

An important feature of this system is its non-threatening aspect. The only form that is to be viewed and officially recorded is the supervisor's form. The self-evaluation forms and the student reaction questionnaires are for the teacher's personal use only. The supervisor need only to check on whether or not the teacher used these forms, but not on the actual content. Students are not to identify themselves on the student reaction questionnaire. Their anonymity ensures getting candid results. The confidential nature of this system fosters a willingness to cooperate in participating in this experience in professional growth.

THE DELSON-KARAN SUPERVISOR'S RATING SHEET FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS*

Name of Teacher _____ Date _____

Name of Rater _____ Position _____

School _____

Rating Scale: 1) Outstanding 2) Very Good 3) Good 4) Fair

-) Needs Improvement +) Improvement Shown NA) Not applicable

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
I. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER							
A. Written and spoken command of the target language							
B. Accuracy of pronunciation							
C. Knowledge of social customs and contemporary life of the country where the target language is spoken							
D. Knowledge of the geography, history, literature, art, and music of the country where the target language is spoken							
E. Knowledge of linguistics and the nature of language acquisition							
F. Ability to construct appropriate and correct oral and written drills in the target language							
G. Knowledge of the use of audio-visual equipment							
H. Other							
II. TEACHER-EFFECTIVENESS PLANNING AND TECHNIQUES							
A. Aims and objectives of the lesson clearly defined							

* This form is to be used by the supervisor, chairperson, colleague, as an evaluation of progress during the term. Each teacher is to receive several of these completed forms during the semester before the final Summary Evaluation Form is submitted at the end of the semester. It is suggested that at least 3 of these forms be used as a basis for filling out the Summary Evaluation Sheet.

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
B. Links past learning with present							
C. Organizes detailed lesson plans that are logical in sequence							
D. Translates lesson plans into effective teaching performance							
E. Shows freedom from the textbook, creates own materials							
F. Incorporates skillful use of audio-visual aids to enrich and enliven lesson							
G. Creates life situations, using drama, role-playing, etc., enabling students to use the target language in real communication situations							
H. Allows for individual differences, encourages students to share talents and special interests in order to enrich classroom activities							
I. Other							
III. THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURE							
A. Emphasizes open-mindedness and tolerance toward other cultures							
B. Brings benefit of travel or total immersion experiences to the classroom and encourages students to share such experiences as well							
C. Makes use of cultural realia and cultural references to enrich the lesson							
D. Gives students an awareness of the differences in values of American culture and that of the country of the target language							
E. Incorporates cultural aspects of the target language into the lesson							
F. Other							

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
IV. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT A. Physical Conditions							
1. Neatness of classroom							
2. Attractiveness of room decorations							
3. Neatness and legibility of blackboard work							
4. Seating arranged in a variety of ways conducive to different types of learning activities							
5. Other							
B. Economy in Procedure							
1. Efficiency in assigning, collecting, and correcting homework							
2. Use of monotorial assistance to expedite routine matters (i.e. taking attendance, erasing boards, etc.)							
3. Readiness of room and materials at the start of the lesson							
4. Other							
C. Economy in Lesson Presentation							
1. Balances time allotment for various activities							
2. Paces learning in accordance with student response, adapts plan in accordance with unexpected situations							
3. Provides transitions from one activity to another							
4. Designs medial and final summaries to clarify learning points							
5. Other							

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
D. Student Participation							
1. Provides varying types of learning, individual, group, etc. according to the objectives of the lesson and the needs of the the students							
2. Uses peer teaching							
3. Uses native speakers and/or students as "student teacher," making lessons less teacher-centered							
5. Provides for lively interaction between student and teacher and student and student							
6. All students are given an opportunity to participate chorally and individually during the lesson using the target language							
7. Other							
E. Questioning 1. Questions are clearly formulated							
2. Questions are distributed so as to adapt to the ability of the student responding							
3. Puts questions to class first, not to individuals							
4. Calls students by name							
5. Distributes questions evenly, avoids calling on same students							
6. Provides opportunity for students to make up questions and not just give answers							
7. Other							
V. PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS A. In the Presentation of the Lesson							
1. Uses continual motivations and transitions to maintain a high level of interest							

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
2, Activities, questions, and exercises are personalized, relating to the students' lives							
3. Uses imagination in the classroom to facilitate the loss of inhibition in speaking a foreign language							
4. Responds with patience, understanding, and receptiveness to students' comments, questions, and class contributions							
5. Deals tactfully with incorrect answers							
6. Other							
B. <u>In General</u>							
1. Shows a genuine interest and sensitivity to the needs of the students							
2. Shows a contagious enthusiasm for the language and culture taught							
3. Develops concept of self-worth of the students							
4. Uses tact in dealing with students							
5. Shows personal warmth which in turn is transmitted to the students in dealing with each other							
6. Uses humor and encourages students to do so							
7. Shows a positive attitude, praises students frequently							
8. Copes effectively with discipline							
9. Establishes a good personal rapport with the students							
10. Other							

	1	2	3	4	-	+	NA
VI. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS							
A. Communication skills, written and oral, neatness of boardwork, hand-outs							
B. Ability to project while teaching (i.e. poise, vitality, self-confidence)							
C. Voice quality (clarity, volume, tone)							
D. Creativity and imagination							
E. Initiative, self-reliance, self-direction							
F. Appearance, dress, grooming							
G. Conscientiousness							
H. Other							
VII. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE							
A. Shows willingness to accept and implement suggestions from supervisors							
B. Shows ability to evaluate own teaching performance and the desire to learn and grow as a teacher							
C. Other							
VIII. OVERALL EVALUATION							

Additional comments and suggestions:
(Be as specific as possible. Use other side if necessary.)

THE DELSON-KARAN SUMMARY EVALUATION FORM FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

This form is to be filled in by the supervisor at the end of the semester using the previous longer rating sheets as a basis.

Name of Teacher_____ Date_____

Name of Supervisor_____ Schpol_____

Rating Scale: 1) Outstanding 2) Very Good 3) Good 4) Fair

-) Needs Improvement +) Improvement Shown

	1	2	3	4	-	+
I. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER						
II. TEACHER-EFFECTIVENESS						
A. Planning						
B. Techniques						
III. THE PRESENTATION OF CULTURE						
IV. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT						
A. Physical Conditions						
B. Economy in Procedure						
C. Economy in Lesson Presentation						
D. Student Participation						
E. Questioning						
V. PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS						
A. In the Presentation of the Lesson						
B. In general						
VI. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS						
VII. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE						
VIII. OVERALL EVALUATION						

Additional comments and suggestions :
(Be as specific as possible)

THE DELSON-KARAN SELF-EVALUATION FORM FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

PART I

Objectives: To analyze the extent of student participation, the ratio of teacher/student talk, and the ratio of English/ target language use

Basis:
1. Videotape of the lesson
   and/or
2. Cassette tape of the lesson

Directions: The following seating chart can be filled in by the supervisor, chairperson, colleague or student-teacher during a recorded lesson or the teacher himself can fill it in while viewing the videotape or listening to the cassette. Observations can be shared and compared. Put a line in the appropriate box each time the teacher or student speaks in the class,or when the class responds in unison.

SAMPLE CHART FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF CLASS PARTICIPATION AND THE USE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN CLASS

Peter Deutsch		Rosemary Dunn		Marcia Ehrlich		Robert Nelson	
E	FL	E	FL	E	FL	E	FL
||	|||	|	|	|||	𝍸	|	

Juan Ruiz		Renata Maimone		Peggy Chang		Dan Halpern	
E	FL	E	FL	E	FL	E	FL
||	||		|||		|		

TEACHER-TALK			CLASS RESPONSE	
E		FL	C	W
𝍸 𝍸 𝍸 ||		𝍸 𝍸 𝍸 𝍸 |||	𝍸 𝍸 |	𝍸

Key: E = Response given in English
FL = Response given in the foreign language
C = Choral response given by the whole class
W = Written response given by the whole class

PART II *

THE DELSON-KARAN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS' CHECKLIST ON SELF-OBSERVATION [1]

	Yes	No
1. Did you motivate the lesson continuously and successfully?		
2. Was the lesson lively?		
3. Did the lesson drag in places?		
4. Was your lesson planned detailed enough and well-prepared?		
5. Did you show a good sense of organization during the lesson?		
6. Was the time for homework correction kept to a minimum?		
7. Was the time for each activity distributed well?		
8. Did you personalize the lesson material?		
9. Was there a variety of activities?		
10. Did you rely too heavily on the textbook or did you create some of your own materials?		
11. Did you bring any of your own personal experiences to the lesson?		
12. Did you incorporate any audio-visual aids into the lesson?		
13. Did you enrich the lesson with any cultural material?		
14. Were you tactful in dealing with incorrect answers?		
15. Did you talk mostly <u>about</u> the language or did you talk the language?		
16. Did you plan an activity for extemporaneous use of the language?		
17. Did you feel you had a good rapport with your class? Were they 'with you' today?		
18. Did you use humor in the lesson? Was there any laughter?		
19. Did all of the students have a chance to participate adequately?		
20. Were your explanations clear to your students?		
21. Did you have medial and final summaries to clarify new points?		
22. Did you allow time for questions?		
23. Did the students feel that they accomplished something new with the use of the language after this class?		
24. If you were a student in this class, would you have enjoyed it?		
25. Other		

Strong Points in This Lesson	What Could Be Improved

(Use other side if necessary.)

* This form is to be used on a regular basis

THE DELSON-KARAN FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENT REACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The Teacher's Capabilities and Qualities

	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor
1. The teacher's enthusiasm for teaching is				
2. The teacher's fluency in the foreign language is				
3. The teacher's accent in the foreign language is				
4. The teacher's explanations are				
5. The teacher's preparation of lessons is				
6. The variety of class activities is				
7. The pace of the class is				
8. The teacher's sense of humor is				
9. The appearance of the teacher is				
10. The teacher's tone of voice is				
11. The teacher's facial expression is				
12. The teacher's liveliness while teaching is				
13. Other				

Class Participation and Student-Teacher Rapport

1. The amount of use of the foreign language by the teacher and students is				
2. The teacher's stimulation of students to express themselves extemporaneously in class is				
3. The opportunity for all students to participate in each class is				
4. The fairness of the tests and grading is				
5. The length and helpfulness of the homework is				
6. The teacher's willingness to answer questions is				
7. The teacher's availability to discuss problems outside of class is				
8. The teacher's use of praise in class is				
9. The teacher's tact in dealing with incorrect answers is				
10. The teacher's effort to avoid embarrassing students is				
11. The teacher's effort not to show favoritism is				

	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor
12. The teacher's interest in the students is				
13. The teacher's concern that the students learn and understand the foreign language is				
14. The teacher's classroom control is				
15. The teacher's willingness to accept suggestions and ideas from the students is				
16. The patience shown by the teacher is				
17. The arrangement of the classroom is				
18. The teacher's attempt to bring his/her own personality and interests to the class is				
19. The teacher's ability to bring the students' interests and personal qualities into the classroom is				
20. The classroom atmosphere is				
21. Other				

The Students' Learning Accomplishments

	Much Better	Better	Same	Worse
1. My ability to understand the foreign language when it is spoken is				
2. My ability to express myself in the foreign language is. . .				
3. My ability to read in the foreign language is				
4. My ability to understand the culture and the way of life where the foreign language is spoken is				
5. My pronunciation in the foreign language is				
6. My enjoyment of the language is				
7. My understanding of the grammar of the foreign language is. .				

	Exc.	Good	Fair	Poor
My Overall Rating of the Teacher is				

If you could choose your teacher for next term, would you like to have this teacher again ? (Circle Yes or No) Yes No

Does the teacher have a verbal tic? (i.e. OK, très bien, etc.)
If so, what is it? (Use blank space to write it in) _____

List Comments on the Teacher and the Class:
Please be specific. Use other side of this page for your comments.

What I Liked Most | What I Would Like to Change

SUMMARY

This system represents a contribution to methods of teacher evaluation for the following reasons:

1) It is 3-dimensional and therefore renders a more thorough picture of a teacher's performance.
2) The forms are easy to use and require no special training for their implementation.
3) The assessment forms are specifically geared to foreign language instruction.
4) It includes a student reaction questionnaire that can be used both at the secondary and university levels.
5) It evaluates verbal as well as nonverbal behavior.
6) It is multi-dimensional in its theoretical composition, since it contains categories to measure social-emotional, cognitive, and administrative behaviors.
7) It allows room for write-in items so that the teachers and supervisors who use them can adapt them to their own curriculum goals.
8) It includes objective items as well as space for free response, thereby providing a means to assess teaching performance both objectively and subjectively.

OBSERVATION

In addition to being instruments for evaluation, these forms serve a valuable function in that they set up the criteria and objectives of excellence in teaching. Using the the forms makes the teacher aware of just what is to be accomplished in the classroom in order to be a better teacher.

CONCLUSION

The relationship of effective evaluation to excellence in teaching cannot be overemphasized. If a teacher wishes to grow and improve during the course of his teaching career, he must submit himself to constant evaluation and re-evaluation. Otherwise, he will not be able to give his students an ever-improving quality of instruction.

Teachers should heed the word of Robert Burns:

> O was some Power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us!
> It was frae mony a blunder free us,
> 'An foolish notion . . . . . [23]

NOTES

1. Gertrude Moskowitz, "The Classroom Interaction of Outstanding Foreign Language Teachers," Foreign Language Annals, 2 (1976), 135-57.

2. Leonard Brisley, et al., "Good Teaching Practices: A Survey of High School Foreign Language Classes," in Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages (New York: Modern Language Association, 1961), 219-43.

3. Robert Politzer and Louis Weiss, The Successful Foreign-Language Teacher, Report, (Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1969).

4. William Alexander, Are You a Good Teacher? (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960).

5. Theodore Huebener, How to Teach Foreign Languages Effectively (New York: New York University Press, 1967).

6. Ibid., 226-31.

7. David N. Aspy and Flora N. Roebuck, Kids Don't Learn from People They Don't Like (Amherst, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press, 1977).

8. N.L. Gage, ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

9. Robert M.W. Travers, ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (New York: Rand McNally, 1973).

10. Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst, "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed., Robert M.W. Travers (New York: Rand McNally, 1973).

11. Anita Simon and E. Gill Boyer, eds., Mirrors for Behavior (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools; I-VI, 1967; VII-XIV and Summary I-II, 1970).

12. Ned A. Flanders, Interaction Analysis in the Classroom: A Manual for Observers (Michigan: University of Michigan, 1965).

13. Mary Jane Aschner, James J. Gallagher, et al., A System for Classifying Thought Processes in the Context of Classroom Verbal Interaction (Urbana, Illinois: Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, Univ. of Illinois, 1965).

14. Charles Galloway, "Nonverbal Communication," Theory Into Practice, 7 (1968), 172-75.

15. Peggy Amidon, Nonverbal Interaction Analysis (Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching, 1971).

16. E. Orrin Nearhoff, "Teach Pupil Interaction in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Technique for Self-Evaluation," in Frank M. Grittner, Teaching Foreign Languages (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 328-40.

17. E.C. Wragg, "Interaction Analysis in the Foreign Language Classroom," Modern Language Journal, 54 (1970), 116-20.

18. Gertrude Moskowitz, The FLint System: An Observational Tool for the Foreign Language Class (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1972).

19. Gertrude Moskowitz, "A Comparison of Foreign Language Teachers Trained and Not Trained in Interaction Analysis," American Foreign Language Teacher, 1 (1970), 10-15.

20. Constance K. Knop, "Developing a Model for Student Teacher Supervision," Foreign Language Annals, 6 (1977), 634-35.

21. Alice C. Omaggio, "The Relationship Between Personalized Classroom Talk and Teacher Effectiveness Ratings: Some Research Results," Foreign Language Annals, 4 (1982) 258-59.

22. Leona Bailey, "An Observational Method in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Closer Look at Interaction Analysis," Foreign Language Annals, 8 (1975), 335.

23. Robert Burns, cited in Frank Grittner, Teaching Foreign Languages (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), 324.

BIO-DATA STATEMENT

Myrna Delson-Karan, Ph.D. (ABD), New York University, is an Adjunct Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education at New York University, Washington Square, New York City, N.Y.